UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,174	04/04/2000	Hung-Mao Lin	1532P	5884

7590 10/23/2002

Sawyer Law Group LLP
PO Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER
DOOLEY, MATTHEW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 10/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/542,174	Applicant(s) LIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew C. Dooley	Art Unit 2133	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 April 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 April 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. Figures 1-3 are objected to under section 608.02(l) in the M.P.E.P. Portions of the figures are not consistent with the requirements as set forth in the aforementioned section, specifically with regards to "Every line, number, and letter must be...sufficiently dense and dark, and uniformly thick and well defined." Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohhata et al., U.S. 5,402,377.

As per claim 1:

Ohhata teaches of a secondary memory array that provides a cache for a memory unit (Fig.2). Inclusive in the taught method of increasing the yield of the memory cell is a method of determining when an access is made to a failed memory bit location in the memory cell, and then substituting a memory location in the cached memory location when the defective location is accessed (Col.2: 55-68).

As per claim 2:

Ohhata teaches of identifying each failed bit location and storing an indication of the failed memory bit location in the cache memory cell (Col.2: 60-69).

As per claim 3:

The cached memory array of Ohhata acts as a lookup table (Fig.2).

As per claim 15:

Claim 15 is the corresponding apparatus claim to method claim 1. As such, analogous reasoning can be used in the rejection of claim 15 as was used in the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 18:

Claim 18 is the corresponding apparatus claim to method claim 2. As such, analogous reasoning can be used in the rejection of claim 18 as was used in the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 6-7,16-17, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohhata et al., U.S. 5,402,377, in view of Bhavsar et al., U.S. 6,408,401.

As per claim 4:

Not explicitly taught by Ohhata is a method utilizing a comparison of the failed bit locations. Bhavsar teaches to a bit failure location comparison used for the purpose of identification of a faulty memory cell (Col.2: 10-16). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of the comparison techniques taught by Bhavsar in conjunction with the method of Ohhata because the explicit comparison methodology allows for precise notification of faulty memory cells (Bhavsar, Col.2: 10-12).

As per claim 6:

The circuitry of Bhavsar allows for the cache to be of a SRAM type (Col.2: 6-8).

As per claim 7:

The circuitry of Bhavsar allows for the cache to be of a DRAM type (Col.2: 6-8).

As per claim 16:

Claim 16 is the corresponding apparatus claim to method claim 7. As such, analogous reasoning can be used in the rejection of claim 16 as was used in the rejection of claim 7 above.

As per claim 17:

Claim 17 is the corresponding apparatus claim to method claim 6. As such, analogous reasoning can be used in the rejection of claim 17 as was used in the rejection of claim 6 above.

As per claim 19:

Claim 19 is the corresponding apparatus claim to method claim 4. As such, analogous reasoning can be used in the rejection of claim 19 as was used in the rejection of claim 4 above.

6. Claims 5, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohhata et al., U.S. 5,402,377, in view of Douceur, U.S. 5,838,893.

As per claim 5:

Ohhata does not teach of a method including a pre-scan operation on the memory array for the purpose of identifying a failed memory cell location. Douceur teaches that it is known to make a determination of faulty memory cell locations upon device startup (Col.1: 47-56). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the testing methodology set forth by Douceur in the method provided by Ohhata because testing at startup allows for an early determination to be made on the error status of the memory cell location (Douceur, Col.1: 55-56).

As per claim 8:

Shown above is a combination of Douceur and Ohhata that allows for a pre-scan operation to be performed whereby a memory location is swapped into a cache location.

As per claim 9:

The cache memory array of Ohhata is between a primary memory array, and a memory control unit (Fig.2).

As per claim 10:

The cached memory array of Ohhata acts as a lookup table (Fig.2).

As per claim 11:

The memory control unit of Ohhata is responsible for the swapping of memory locations between the primary array and the cache memory array upon detection of a failed memory location (Col. 2: 55-69).

As per claim 12:

The memory control unit of Ohhata is responsible for the swapping of memory locations between the primary array and the cache memory array (Col. 2: 55-69).

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohhata et al., U.S. 5,402,377, in view of Douceur, U.S. 5,838,893, and in further view of Bhavsar et al., U.S. 6,408,401.

As per claim 13:

It has been shown above that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the testing methodology set forth by Douceur in the method provided by Ohhata because testing at startup allows for an early determination to be made on the error status of the memory cell location (Douceur, Col.1: 55-56). Likewise, it has been shown above that it too would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of the comparison techniques taught by Bhavsar in conjunction with the method of Ohhata because the explicit comparison methodology allows for precise notification of faulty memory cells (Bhavsar, Col.2: 10-12). Moreover, it was shown that the circuitry of Bhavsar allows for the cache to be of a DRAM type (Col.2: 6-8). The combinations of the methods demonstrated above would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make

at the time of the invention because these combinations allow for early error location determinations to be made on the error status of the memory cell location, wherein the precision of the memory cell error notification becomes more precise, thus leading to better overall system functionality.

As per claim 14:

It has been shown above that it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the testing methodology set forth by Douceur in the method provided by Ohhata because testing at startup allows for an early determination to be made on the error status of the memory cell location (Douceur, Col.1: 55-56). Likewise, it has been shown above that it too would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make use of the comparison techniques taught by Bhavsar in conjunction with the method of Ohhata because the explicit comparison methodology allows for precise notification of faulty memory cells (Bhavsar, Col.2: 10-12). Moreover, it was shown that the circuitry of Bhavsar allows for the cache to be of a SRAM type (Col.2: 6-8). The combinations of the methods demonstrated above would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to make at the time of the invention because these combinations allow for early error location determinations to be made on the error status of the memory cell location, wherein the precision of the memory cell error notification becomes more precise, thus leading to better overall system functionality.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohhata et al., U.S. 5,402,377, in view of in view of Bhavsar et al., U.S. 6,408,401, and Torrance et al. "A 33 GB/s 13.4Mb Integrated Graphics Accelerator and Frame Buffer," IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference 1998.

As per claim 20:

Ohhata teaches of a secondary memory array that provides a cache for a memory unit (Fig.2). Inclusive in the taught system for increasing the yield of the memory cell is a means for determining when an access is made to a failed memory bit location in the memory cell, and then substituting a memory location in the cached memory location when the defective location is accessed (Col.2: 55-68). The circuitry of Bhavsar allows for the cache to be of a DRAM type (Col.2: 6-8). Moreover, Torrance teaches that a system with a memory module can be utilized in conjunction with a graphics accelerator (Fig.2). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine graphic accelerator circuitry into the device of Ohhata, as adjusted above in the combination with Bhavsar, because Ohhata allows for the test mapping of the memory array circuit, a testing methodology which is cited as by Torrance as a means for testing the embedded memory cell of a graphics accelerator.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Dooley whose telephone number is (703) 306-5538. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (703) 305-9595. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Matthew Dooley
Examiner AU 2133
October 21, 2002

ALBERT DECADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100